UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/682,547	10/10/2003	Minoru Sato	117153	9736

25944 7590 11/29/2006

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. BOX 19928
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320

EXAMINER	
NGUYEN, KEVIN M	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2629	

DATE MAILED: 11/29/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/682,547	SATO ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Kevin M. Nguyen	2629	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10 October 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-10* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-10* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☒ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

Claim Objections

1. Claims 1-10 are objected to because of the following informalities: claims 1-10 should begin with a new line with indentation for each line. Claim 24 is objected to because the lines are crowded too closely together, making reading difficult. Substitute claims with lines one and one-half or double spaced on good quality paper are required. See 37 CFR 1.52(b).

2. The claim 3 is objected to because they include reference characters which are not enclosed within parentheses.

Reference characters corresponding to elements recited in the detailed description of the drawings and used in conjunction with the recitation of the same element or group of elements in the claims should be enclosed within parentheses so as to avoid confusion with other numbers or characters which may appear in the claims. See MPEP § 608.01(m).

3. The recitation of claims 1-10 has not been given patentable weight in the preamble. A preamble is generally accorded any patentable weight where it recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim depends on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4. Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter, because no useful program is being recited in the claims. The disclosed invention is inoperative and therefore lacks utility. The examiner has no idea how an image displaying program or an image data output program are controlling or what features in the system are causing the image displaying system to perform operations.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1, 2 and 6-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamimaki et al (US 5,812,859) hereinafter Kamimaki in view of Bruning (US 6,989,801).

7. As to claim 1, figures 1-4 of Kamimaki teaches an image displaying system which has an image displaying device to display an image and a plurality of terminals to store image data for said image, said image displaying device and said terminals being connected with each other through a network that permits

their two-way communications, and said image displaying device displaying an image in response to said image data transmitted thereto from each of said terminals, wherein said image displaying device comprises a communication means at the displaying device side to perform two-way communications with said terminals an image data acquisition controlling means to acquire image data from a relevant terminal in such a way that when it acquires image data from a relevant terminal by controlling said communication means at the displaying device side, it instructs other terminals to suspend transmission, thereby suspending transmission of image data, and an image displaying means to display an image in response to the image data acquired as the result of control by said image data acquisition controlling means, and each of said terminals comprises a storage medium to store said image data, a communication means at the terminal side to perform two-way communications with said image displaying device, and an image data output controlling means which controls said communication means at the terminal side in such a way that the terminal suspends output of image data when it is instructed to suspend transmission by said image data acquisition controlling means and the terminal outputs image data when it is not instructed to suspend transmission in col. 8, line 1 through col. 9, line 27.

Kamimaki teaches all of the claimed limitation, except for said image displaying device and said terminals being connected with each other through a network that permits their two-way communications. However, figure 6 of Bruning teaches system 10 comprising a network unit 22 coupled to presentation device

14 configured to provide two-way communication between presentation device 14 and at least remote user node 24 in col. 8, lines 46-58.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Bruning into Kamimaki to create the claimed invention. It would have been obvious to modify Kamimaki to make the image displaying device 14 and said remote user nodes 24 being connected with each other through a network 22 that permits their two-way communications as taught by Bruning, because this would provide an interactive presentation format which allows a presenter to note or mark a presentation slide by way of light pen and touch screen, such that a presenter can alter the slide presentation without additional programming and without physically leaving the presentation device or PC running the presentation (see Bruning, col. 1, lines 56-61).

8. As to claims 2, figures 1-4 of Kamimaki teaches an image displaying device which is connected with a plurality of terminals to store image data through a network that permits two-way communications and which acquires image data from each terminal, thereby displaying an image, said image displaying device comprising a communication means at the displaying device side which performs two-way communications with each of said terminals, an image data acquisition controlling means to acquire image data from a relevant terminal in such a way that when it acquires image data from a relevant terminal by controlling said communication means at the displaying device side, it instructs other terminals to suspend transmission, thereby suspending transmission of image data, and an image displaying means to display an image

in response to the image data acquired as the result of control by said image data acquisition controlling means in col. 8, line 1 through col. 9, line 27.

9. The limitation of claims 6-9 are the same as those of claims 1 and 2 and therefore the claim will be rejected using the same rationale.

10. As to claim 10, Figures 1-4 of Kamimaki teaches an image displaying system having a plurality of computers and a projector which are connected with each other through a network, and causing each computer to output image data to the projector for display, in which said projector has a network interface at the projector side which sends and receives packet data through said network, an image data receiving module to acquire image data which is output from said computer through said network interface at the projector side, a hard disk to record the thus acquired image data, a display unit to display an image based on the recorded image data, and a control unit at the projector side which controls the network interface at the projector side, the image receiving module, the hard disk, and the display unit; the controller at the projector side performs control in such a way that when it acquires image data from a specific computer, it instructs other computers to suspend transmission, thereby causing them to suspend transmission of image data, and acquires image data from said specific computer; each of said computers has a network interface at the computer side which sends and receives packet data through the network to which it is connected, a hard disk as a storing medium capable of storing image data, an image transmitting module which acquires image data from this hard disk and outputs them to the projector on the network through the network interface at the

computer side, and a controller at the computer side which controls the network interface at the computer side, the image transmitting module, and the hard disk, and the image transmitting module is controlled such that the computer suspends the outputting of image data if it corresponds to the one which is instructed to suspend transmission by the controller at the projector side and the computer continues the outputting of image data if it does not correspond to the one which is instructed to suspend transmission in col. 8, line 1 through col. 9, line 27.

Kamimaki teaches all of the claimed limitation, except for the projector having a network interface.

However, figure 6 of Bruning teaches system 10 comprising a network unit 22 coupled to presentation device 14 configured to provide two-way communication between presentation device 14 and at least remote user node 24 in col. 8, lines 46-58.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Bruning into Kamimaki to create the claimed invention. It would have been obvious to modify Kamimaki to make the projector 14 having a network interface 22 as taught by Bruning, because this would provide an interactive presentation format which allows a presenter to note or mark a presentation slide by way of light pen and touch screen, such that a presenter can alter the slide presentation without additional programming and without physically leaving the presentation device or PC running the presentation (see Bruning, col. 1, lines 56-61).

11. Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kamimaki and Bruning as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Donahue et al (US 5,835,721) hereinafter Donahue.

12. As to claim 3, the combination of Kamimaki and Bruning teaches all of the claimed limitation, except for a mode switching means to switch the split display mode to and from the sequential display mode (the former displaying on divided sections of one screen more than one image based on individual image data output from a plurality of terminals, and the latter displaying on a full screen one image based on individual image data output from a plurality of terminals and sequentially switching the transmission terminals), so that, in the split display mode, the image displaying means displays images based on said individual image data on the divided sections of one screen and in the sequential display mode, the image displaying means displays one image based on said individual image data on the full screen.

However, figure 9 of Donahue teaches a method and system for data transmission over a network link comprising broken connection processing (710) corresponding to a slide display mode and send data (704) corresponding to the sequential display mode in which the path of the network link to transmit one or both the sender and receiver in col. 10, lines 17-45.

The limitation of claims 4 and 5 are the same as those of claim 1 and therefore the claim will be rejected using the same rationale.

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Donahue into Kamimaki and

Bruning to create the claimed invention. It would have been obvious to modify Kamimaki and Bruning including broken connection processing (710) corresponding to a slide display mode and send data (704) corresponding to the sequential display mode in which the path of the network link to transmit one or both the sender and receiver as taught by Donahue, because this would provide a need for a data transfer method in which lossy connections do not substantially impair the ease with which data can be transferred (see Donahue, col. 1, lines 48-50). The motivation for doing so in col. 2, lines 6-9 of Donahue.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to KEVIN M. NGUYEN whose telephone number is 571-272-7697. The examiner can normally be reached on MON-THU from 8:00-6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, a supervisor RICHARD A. HJERPE can be reached on 571-272-7691. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8000.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the Patent Application Information Retrieval system, see http://portal.uspto.gov/external/portal/pair. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kevin M. Nguyen
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2629

KMN
November 27, 2006